L56KSANC UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 1 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2 3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 4 21 CR 269 (CM) v. 5 MALIK SANCHEZ, 6 Defendant. 7 -----x 8 New York, N.Y. May 6, 2021 9 12:40 p.m. 10 Before: 11 HON. COLLEEN McMAHON, 12 District Judge 13 APPEARANCES 14 AUDREY STRAUSS, 15 Acting United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York 16 KAYLAN E. LASKY Assistant United States Attorney 17 DAVID PATTON FEDERAL DEFENDERS OF NEW YORK 18 Attorney for Defendant 19 BY: CLAY KAMINSKY 20 ALSO PRESENT: 21 Francesca Piperato, Pretrial Services Officer 22 23 24 25

1	(Case called)
2	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Please state your appearances.
3	MS. LASKY: Good afternoon, your Honor. Kaylan Lasky,
4	for the government.
5	THE COURT: Good afternoon, Ms. Lasky.
6	MR. KAMINSKY: Good afternoon, your Honor. Clay
7	Kaminsky, for Malik Sanchez.
8	THE COURT: Good afternoon, Mr. Kaminsky.
9	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Also on the line, Judge, is
10	Francesca Piperato, from pretrial services.
11	Did I say your name correctly, Francesca?
12	MS. PIPERATO: Yes, Francesca Piperato, from pretrial
13	services.
14	THE COURT: Ms. Francesca, okay, good.
15	And, thank you, Francesca, I got the updated report.
16	MS. PIPERATO: No problem, your Honor.
17	MR. KAMINSKY: Your Honor, I don't have the updated
18	report. Is that something I should have?
19	THE COURT: The updated pretrial services report tells
20	me when his next court date is in state court. That's the
21	update.
22	MR. KAMINSKY: Okay. Understood, your Honor.
23	THE COURT: I'm happy to get you a copy.
24	MR. KAMINSKY: That's fine, your Honor.
25	THE COURT: Okay.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Mr. Kaminsky, it's your nickel.

MR. KAMINSKY: Thank you, your Honor.

So we can get into the facts and why conditions can be set that would assure Mr. Sanchez's appearance in court and the safety of the community, but I think there's an antecedent legal issue, which is whether there can even be a contention hearing in this case.

THE COURT: Yes, I understand the antecedent legal issue, and you are correct that the crime that's charged does not fall within the detention hearing statute. It's a bootstrap argument that's being made by the government alleging that the hoax - the hoax, h-o-a-x, hoax, pretend thing - that the government has charged this man with, a crime that the government admits, by virtue of its charge, was never intended to be anything other than pretend, is a crime that involves --I'm sorry, makes this a case - not a crime - makes this a case that involves either an 844(i), the use or threatened use of a weapon of mass destruction, even though if it did, the government would have charged that -- I'm sorry, that's the use of explosives to damage a building or property, the government would have charged that if it really did involve that, or 2332a(a), two little As, use or threatened use of a weapon of mass destruction. Boy, if it really involved that, the government would have charged that. I know this. I withdrew the Newburgh forces.

So, I understand your argument and the government's bootstrap argument. I don't think I'm going to need to get there. It presents a fascinating legal issue, it would make a great law school exam question, but I don't think I need to get there.

Can we talk about the facts and conditions, please?

MR. KAMINSKY: Yes, your Honor.

Your Honor, I think what the conditions should be, which is a little bit more than I proposed in magistrates court --

THE COURT: Right, you didn't propose nearly enough.

MR. KAMINSKY: Your Honor, I think he should be on home detention with electronic monitoring. His mother, who is in the court here today --

THE COURT: Hello, ma'am.

MR. KAMINSKY: -- Nathali Chamba, who works for the Department of Education, will be a third-party custodian, and he will be on home detention with electronic monitoring.

That's my proposal, your Honor. We can do a bond in the amount that your Honor sees fit. May.

I speak a little bit about the risk of flight because I did some preparation on that?

THE COURT: No, I want you to. I mean, that's part of what you need to do.

MR. KAMINSKY: Your Honor, there's no reason to

believe he's a risk of flight. I spoke with his Legal Aid attorney, who I actually hoped to have here, but she got caught up in 100 Centre Street. So here's what happened: On March 20th, he was arrested after he waited — there was an amazing incident that was charged — he waited for the police to arrive, and he calmly was arrested. He has never been accused of — there has never been any bench warrant, there has never been any —

THE COURT: What was the date of the hearing he allegedly missed? Was that the one that was five days after he was put in the Essex County detention facility?

MR. KAMINSKY: No, your Honor. There is — in fairness to the government, there was an earlier one on March 8th, and here's what happened: They gave him a slip of paper when he was arrested that said he was supposed to go to 100 Centre Street. They also took his phones. He communicated diligently with his attorney by email. It turned out that it was supposed to be a remote hearing. His attorney wrote him an email, which he didn't check because he didn't have the phone. He later got it that day. His attorney told him about the hearing on the day of. I have this in confirmation from the Legal Aid attorney. Her name is Jacqueline Dombroff. She told him that day. He didn't get the email. He wrote her that night and said, oh, no, it looks like I missed it, can we reschedule? And then he kept in touch with her after that. He

kept in touch with her before that and after that. A ball was dropped. It was not, in candor and in fairness, dropped by Mr. Sanchez. He was in touch with his attorney. He was not given the information of where he needed to go, no bench warrant was issued, no bench warrant has ever been issued.

THE COURT: That's because there are a lot of problems over there right now. I mean, let's not kid ourselves. I've been in touch with a number of state court judges, including the chief judge, and they're having difficulty getting their operations restarted. It's a much more complicated and cumbersome process than we have to go through. We're very lucky here.

MR. KAMINSKY: Yes.

THE COURT: So, there are balls getting dropped, and I understand that. Then he missed a hearing on the 19th of April, but he couldn't very well go because he was in Essex.

MR. KAMINSKY: Correct. And he was basically kept incommunicado because he was under quarantine.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. KAMINSKY: He successfully completed probation once before. Another element that we might make part of the bail package is mental health treatment. He previously was under the care of a psychiatrist, he got medication, he was in counseling. The care of the psychiatrist ended some years ago. The counseling ended because of the pandemic, and it's during

the pandemic that he appears to have started reaching out in this way through YouTube. You know, I think that psychological and psychiatric care could be part of the bail package, your Honor.

THE COURT: Oh, yeah, oh, yeah, anybody who thinks what I saw in the video was funny is definitely in need of mental healthcare, definitely.

MR. KAMINSKY: Your Honor, the videos clearly aren't funny.

THE COURT: They're not funny.

MR. KAMINSKY: But they're also not a reason to detain a 19-year-old.

The other reason, the risk of flight, the government says that his guidelines range is 30 to 36 months. It's not. That's giving him all kinds of enhancements that don't apply. It is also using each time he says in that 30-second clip that he's going to detonate a bomb is a separate incident of a threat, to say that there's more than one threat. I calculate his guidelines at either zero to six, if he gets credit for this being a one-time thing, where there was a little forethought, or if he doesn't get that credit, then six to twelve. He's in criminal history category --

THE COURT: I take the guidelines -- presumptive guidelines into account very slightly on a crime of this nature.

1 MR. KAMINSKY: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: This is a crime with a five-year statutory maximum penalty. You know how often I see crimes with a five-year statutory penalty? Maybe once every three years.

MR. KAMINSKY: I don't see them very often either, your Honor.

This is -- the government goes into his juvenile records and goes through allegations that weren't even substantiated. I'm not sure -- look, he says some upsetting things, but he's bailable.

THE COURT: Okay. I'll hear from the government. I've read your letter.

MS. LASKY: Thank you, your Honor. I won't belabor all of the different points that we make in our letter. I will highlight a few things, however, for the government's position, which, first of all, I think it's very important to note that despite repeated interactions with the criminal justice system, the defendant is not changing his behavior. This is, of course, in reference to the multiple different arrests —

THE COURT: Yes, but those are state court crimes, and the state court will deal with them. And this Court will not be used as a vehicle to get around the state's policy decisions on bail. Okay? I won't be used in that way. I will not be used in that way.

MS. LASKY: Understood, your Honor.

THE COURT: So, okay. He's got some state crimes that he's been accused of — low-level felony, high-level misdemeanors, I think there are three. He is — maybe one of them was already disposed of. He has state court appearances. The state let him out on those. That's the state's business, it's not mine. And I'm not making a bail decision on the basis of the state court crimes of which he has not yet been convicted. Okay? I will not make a bail decision on that basis.

MS. LASKY: Understood, your Honor. It's his response to judicial and criminal intervention that is of concern to the government.

THE COURT: Why? He had one meaningful response to judicial intervention, and he seems to have gotten through it all right, and then for three years, he didn't do anything.

MS. LASKY: Correct, your Honor. It's the pattern of behavior, particularly in the last six months. And, understood, your Honor, but I think with the recent cases that have been disposed of, as your Honor pointed out, there is the adjournment in contemplation of dismissal, also the conditional discharge for climbing the Queensboro Bridge. Both of those, as I understand it from communications with the state prosecutor, included a condition that the defendant not get rearrested for six months.

THE COURT: And the state court can take care of it.

MS. LASKY: Understood, your Honor.

THE COURT: He's got to go in front of a state judge on the 19th of May. I don't know whether in person or virtually, but he has to do that. And if at that time, the state court, which will undoubtedly be apprised of what you have charged him with, says, you've got yourself arrested, guess what — that's the state court's business, it's not my business.

MS. LASKY: Yes, your Honor.

Additionally, the evidence in this case is very strong. As you've seen already, your Honor, much of this conduct, and the conduct particularly charged here in the bomb threat, is on video, and we also have social media records, statements from victims, which also provide strong incentive to flee. There is also one video --

THE COURT: How do they provide incentive to flee?

MS. LASKY: The fact that the evidence in the case is strong, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. When guys are arrested with drugs, the evidence is strong, and they're presumption cases, and frequently people are let out. This is not a presumption case. Yes, I've seen the crime. I've seen it, because he videotaped it, and he broadcast it on YouTube, and it's disgusting. It's absolutely disgusting. It's juvenile, it's puerile, it's deeply troubling, but it's bailable.

1 MS. LASKY: Yes, your Honor.

Your Honor has also pointed out that this is the most serious -- well, not in these words exactly, but it is the most serious charge the defendant has appeared to face.

THE COURT: Yes, the most serious charge he has appeared to face is that he perpetrated a hoax, he did something pretend, which, under federal law, subjects him to a greater punishment than spraying somebody with pepper spray does under state law.

MS. LASKY: Correct, your Honor, which also provides --

THE COURT: Absolutely true. One of the oddities of federal law, that a real incident subjects him to, I don't know, one to three, and a hoax can subject him to as much as five years.

MS. LASKY: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Right.

MS. LASKY: So it's --

THE COURT: Got that.

MS. LASKY: Understood, your Honor.

So it's for these reasons, your Honor, that the government contends that he is a risk of flight. And I understand you've read the government's submission, so I won't belabor --

THE COURT: I have, I have, and I find that this

defendant poses no serious — by the way, the statute does say serious — serious risk of nonappearance if he is released on the conditions I would propose, which it turns out Mr. Kaminsky has come to his senses and realized are the conditions that he should have proposed all along, which are home confinement, on a bracelet, with mental health counseling. He's had two encounters with the criminal justice system that would be pertinent. He's complied with the conditions of probation for two years, which does not necessarily suggest that he would fail to abide by the orders of this Court.

He failed to attend one videoconference on his state law case in March. I have nothing but respect for the state courts as a former state court judge. I have some understanding of what they must have been laboring under for the last year. I would give pretty much anybody a pass on that basis because I know what difficulty they are having getting restarted, getting people noticed, and things like that. I accept the proffer of Mr. Kaminsky from his state court lawyer that the defendant, as soon as he became aware of the conference, asked his lawyer to have it rescheduled, which does not suggest that he is someone who is trying to avoid coming to court when he's required to come to court. He obviously missed his conference on April 21st, but that's because he was in the Essex County Jail. And I want to make sure he doesn't miss the next conference, so that the state court judge can decide

whether, in light of what has happened since he or she last saw Mr. Sanchez since he was arrested, the dispositions on the previous state court cases should be reversed, or that new conditions should be set, or even that they should put him in on bail on his state court case. That's a decision for the state court judge to make at his next scheduled appearance.

It's my assessment that if he's kept in his parents' home 24/7 on a monitoring bracelet, he does not present a serious risk of nonappearance.

Do you want to argue danger?

MS. LASKY: If your Honor is saying that danger is not pertinent because we're not capable of getting to that place, then I won't waste the Court's time, your Honor.

THE COURT: Well, yeah, because I just don't think you even come close on nonappearance. I really don't.

MS. LASKY: Understood.

THE COURT: So I, again, with great respect for

Judge Wang, she was in a position where she had to make a

decision fairly quickly. I've had a lot of time to consider

this. They don't have that luxury upfront in the arraignment

part, but --

MS. LASKY: Yes, your Honor. The government also does raise the argument about serious risk that the defendant will threaten or intimidate witnesses --

THE COURT: There's absolutely no proof that this

defendant would threaten or intimidate a witness or that he even would know how to do so. His crimes, the things he's done that I've seen on tape, involved his going up to total strangers. He doesn't know their names, he doesn't know where they live. How is he supposed to intimidate them?

MS. LASKY: There is at least one incident, your Honor, where a person associated with one of the macing victims calls 911, her contact information was posted as part of his video. His followers, as I understand it, have since actually doxxed her, meaning they have sent her text messages and posted her information.

THE COURT: Has he?

MS. LASKY: No, your Honor, but I'm saying --

THE COURT: Has he violated any of his orders of protection?

MS. LASKY: Not as far as I know, your Honor.

THE COURT: Fine. Because if he violates an order of protection, all you have to do is call Mr. O'Neill, and he will be in so quick, his head won't have stopped spinning.

MS. LASKY: Understood, your Honor. I was just saying there was one instance where he knows the contact information and name of an individual.

But, understood, your Honor. If it's preferable to the Court, at this point, to talk about conditions --

THE COURT: I think we should talk seriously about

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

conditions.

MS. LASKY: Okay, your Honor.

THE COURT: This is a young man who, as far as I can tell -- if you watched the video, and I have, of the incident that underlies this case, the first thing I thought was, this is a kid who needs to be seeing a psychiatrist, this is somebody who needs mental health counseling. I don't know if he needs to be on medication, I have no idea, I'm not that kind of a professional. Mr. Kaminsky tells me he has previously been on medication, so that it's possible that this is the process of being off his meds. I don't know. A lot of these kinds of things have cropped up during the pandemic. definitely need to get a mental health counselor, we definitely need to have him imprisoned, in quotes, in his home. But he comes from what appears to be a good, solid family, with whom he has appropriate parental child relationship, lives with his family. I just think that home confinement here - I don't know what else the government needs or wants - but with a relatively low bond, and an appropriate number of cosigners, and a little speech from me, we should be able to -- travel documents surrendered, no travel plus home confinement means home confinement, as he's about to find out, I think we should be able to dispose of this case fairly quickly, because I will say one thing for the government, it has very strong evidence.

MS. LASKY: Your Honor, if I may, at the last

conference, as I recall, defense counsel had suggested a prohibition on live streaming.

THE COURT: Yes, that would be included in my conditions as well.

MS. LASKY: So would that be -- just to clarify for the record, would that be a prohibition on using an internet-capable device in order to ensure that that is adhered to, your Honor?

THE COURT: I don't think he can communicate with his lawyer.

MR. KAMINSKY: Yes, he's got to have internet access, so I can send him discovery, so he can do remote proceedings in the state. You'll know if he posts, right? I'm sure --

THE COURT: I assume pretrial can monitor that and will know if he posts.

Francesca, are you still on?

MS. PIPERATO: Yes.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Did you hear the question?

THE COURT: So the question here is: We want to put a prohibition on him, as a condition of pretrial release, that he not post videos, or chats, or messages on the internet. Is there some way that you all can monitor that? I want him to be able to communicate with his attorney, so he needs to have email.

MS. PIPERATO: There's a little static on the line.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Hold on. The Judge will pick up the line. Let me just make sure we can do that.

THE COURT: No, I don't think we can do that.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: I have two people on it.

Should I ask her the question, Judge?

THE COURT: Yes. I'm going to ask Mr. O'Neill, who's at a better microphone, I think.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Francesca?

MS. PIPERATO: Yes.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: The Judge is asking: One, do you have the ability to monitor the defendant's online activity?

MS. PIPERATO: We can monitor his computer. If the defendant has a laptop, we can monitor if he's not to have, like, social media accounts. We can see what he views on that one computer, or laptop, or iPad.

THE COURT: Okay. And his phones have been confiscated, right? The government has his phones, correct?

MS. LASKY: Yes, your Honor, although that is not to stop him from getting a new phone, of course.

But my understanding from another case that was somewhat analogous was that there might be issues if he, for example, started a new account or used a different streaming service that pretrial was not aware of, and so, in that case, it was set that he or she, in that case, was not able to use the internet except to communicate with lawyers or for medical

reasons with the permission of pretrial, your Honor, for that reason.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, that's a good condition.

I do have another question for you that Mr. O'Neill reminds me. What has happened to the magazines? Which was really the only truly concerning thing in the underlying record, was the magazines.

MS. LASKY: They're part of the arrest evidence, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. So you've got them?

MS. LASKY: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

Well, I have the most recent report from pretrial, which does recommend, continues to recommend, that the defendant be released on bond, cosigned by two financially responsible persons, with the defendant's mother to sign as the third-party custodian, and with a number of conditions.

So, I'm going to do that, and so we need to have a \$10,000 bond, to be signed by two financially responsible persons. That means they have to be acceptable to the government.

And, ma'am, I'm going to make you what's called a third-party custodian of your son. Okay?

So, Mr. Sanchez, I'm going to have to explain how you're going to live until this case gets resolved or until the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

state court does something with you, which they have a perfect right to do in connection with their cases.

You're going to live at home. You're going to have an electronic monitoring bracelet put on you, a location monitoring bracelet, so that your pretrial services officer who is supervising you will know if you leave the house. you're only allowed to leave the house - you're only allowed to leave the house - to meet with your lawyer at times that are preapproved by your pretrial services officer, to meet with a doctor - I know many of these doctors' appointments, especially counseling appointments, are taking place virtually these days, which is another reason that we can't completely cut the defendant off from the internet, because the mental health part of this is very important to me - but to have medical appointments, to come to court, to attend religious services, and that's it. That's it. Other than that -- and all those things have to be cleared in advance with your pretrial officer because the officer knows that at 10:00 o'clock in the morning on June 10th, you're going to be at your lawyer's office. right? But other than that, you can't leave the house. You can't be working for DoorDash, I'm sorry, you can't be dashing around town.

So, in essence, you're going to stay in jail, but jail is going to be your parents' home.

THE DEFENDANT: I understand.

THE COURT: Okay.

The minute that -- the pretrial officer is going to help your family set this up, and there will be a phone in your home that when they call, you better pick up that phone, because if you don't pick up that phone, the next call they're going to make is to me, and, at that point, the government's position here becomes much more convincing to me, and I'm very happy to sign a warrant for your arrest. You don't have any margin for error here. One misstep, you're going in. I can't say it any more clearly than that. I want you to understand it.

Now, here are the conditions:

One, you surrender your passport, all travel documents, and make no new applications under any name for travel documents;

You're restricted to the Southern and Eastern

Districts of New York, but you're on home confinement, so,

basically, that means that what you can do is go to religious

services or go to court here in the Southern District of New

York, but not in Connecticut and not in New Jersey;

You'll obtain or maintain employment as approved by pretrial or be involved in educational programs as approved by pretrial, but it cannot be a kind of employment that requires you to have internet access or that allows you to be dashing all over town. That's -- excuse me, no, you're going to talk

to your lawyer, not to me. Let me finish with the conditions. Okay?

You are required to have mental health evaluation and treatment. You are very much in need of some mental health counseling, very much, based on what I've seen so far. And if medication is prescribed for you by a mental health treatment provider, you must take the medication. That's a condition of your supervision;

You may not possess a firearm, a weapon, or destructive device, or — let me underscore this — ammunition for a firearm, weapon, or destructive device;

You have to make all your state court dates;

You have to abide by the temporary orders of protection that have been entered against you, have absolutely no contact with any of your victims on the state crimes or this crime. Should you have any knowledge of who they are or a way to do that, you can have no contact with them at all;

Your use of the internet during your pretrial supervision period is limited to contact with your lawyer, and the mental health treatment provider, and your pretrial services officer. That's three people — your lawyer, pretrial, the mental health counselor — nobody else, nobody else;

You may not post any tweets, sweets, videos,
Instagrams under your name or any other name or handle of any
sort while this is pending.

2.2

Do you understand me?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Good. Because I hear about one, in you go.

Yes, Mr. Kaminsky.

MR. KAMINSKY: It occurs to me, your Honor, that so limiting his internet usage may prevent him from applying for jobs, which I think might be a good thing.

THE COURT: Whether he applies for a job or not is up to pretrial. I'm inclined to leave him where he is; I'm inclined to leave him in his home.

MR. KAMINSKY: Okay.

THE COURT: All right. At least until the mental health counselor gets a hold of him, and we know what we're doing. But what I said was obtain and maintain employment as approved by pretrial, educational programs as provided and approved by pretrial. Pretrial may want him to go to school, I don't know, but I need him to be off the internet as much as humanly possible, okay? So if there's something that comes up, Mr. Kaminsky, that would require a modification of this condition, you can talk to the government, and you can always come to me.

MR. KAMINSKY: Understood.

The other issue, and maybe this is asking for too much, your Honor, is it occurs to me if he's going to be in his

1	apartment all day and not able to work, it might be good for
2	him to be able to use Netflix or something like that.
3	THE COURT: Mr. Kaminsky, I've imposed a condition.
4	Your client
5	MR. KAMINSKY: I'll send him some books, your Honor.
6	THE COURT: Your client used the internet to broadcast
7	something that never should have happened, and I really think
8	this is a bailable case, but that's all I think, Mr. Kaminsky.
9	MR. KAMINSKY: Understood.
10	THE COURT: I watched that video. That is a terrible
11	thing to do to anybody - a terrible thing to do to anybody -
12	and he used the internet to do it.
13	Also, Francesca, from pretrial, I want drug testing.
14	MS. PIPERATO: I'm sorry, your Honor, I couldn't hear.
15	THE COURT: Drug testing. I'm imposing that as a
16	condition.
17	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Francesca, the Judge is asking if
18	drug testing condition is appropriate.
19	THE COURT: No, I'm saying it's going to happen. I've
20	decided it's appropriate.
21	THE DEPUTY CLERK: It will be listed, Francesca.
22	MS. PIPERATO: Okay. Can I, if possible, clarify one

MS. PIPERATO: Home detention with location

condition that I didn't hear?

THE COURT: Yes.

23

24

25

monitoring?

THE COURT: That is correct, Francesca.

MS. PIPERATO: Okay. If possible, can it please be noted that the defendant is permitted to self-install the equipment at the direction of pretrial services?

THE COURT: Francesca, I'm not sure how that works. We have here a crime that is alleged to have been committed using the internet. I want him to have as little to do with this as possible, but if you can provide the equipment and instructions for how to install it? Is that what you want to do?

MS. PIPERATO: Well, for the home detention, because I'm talking about the bracelet, it allows us to have him report home and directs him $-\!$

THE COURT: Wait, wait, wait.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Francesca, stop.

THE COURT: Slow down, Francesca.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: You're going to start from the top.

The court reporter did not get what you said. Explain what

you're trying to tell the judge.

MS. PIPERATO: Okay. For home detention with location monitoring, we would ask the Court to note that the defendant be permitted to self-install the equipment. This allows us to direct the defendant to report home and to his installing the remaining equipment with our direction.

THE COURT: Okay, if that's what you're doing these days. Is that what you're routinely doing these days,

Francesca? Is that the usual procedure these days?

MS. PIPERATO: Yes, it is.

THE COURT: Okay. Then fine.

MS. PIPERATO: And for the computer monitoring, if the Court would like to know, pretrial services is to monitor the defendant's computer, then we would have somebody install that equipment and monitor his internet access.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, pretrial services must monitor his computer usage, must monitor his computer usage.

MS. PIPERATO: Yes.

THE COURT: So I understand you're trying to avoid making a home visit. You may have to make a home visit, or somebody from your office who is vaccinated may have to make a home visit in this case, but whatever equipment is needed has to be installed.

MS. PIPERATO: I believe the equipment for the computer, I don't think we physically have to be there to install it.

THE COURT: I'm sorry, I didn't understand that.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Repeat that, Francesca.

MS. PIPERATO: For the computer monitoring equipment, I'm not exactly sure if someone has to physically be there or have the defendant report to the office. I can get

clarification on that.

THE COURT: Ah, okay. You'll need to get clarification on that because I really have to tell you, I'd rather somebody went to his home and installed it.

Were there other conditions?

MS. LASKY: If I may, your Honor, just to clarify — sorry — again, on the internet point, is it your Honor's condition that he is not to have his own internet—capable phone, such that he could have a flip phone if he's calling his lawyer, for example, or something? I just don't know if pretrial can similarly monitor a phone that is capable of using the internet.

THE COURT: I know less than you know. I know less than you know. If there is a phone, a noninternet-capable phone, that will allow him to call his lawyer, fine, but I know for a fact that he's going to need to have some internet-capable device in order to have the mental health counseling, because it's not going to be in person, it's going to be remote. That's what they're all doing these days.

MS. LASKY: Understood, your Honor. I think it's the difference between having your own device or, for example, using a family device that isn't a constant temptation, but I defer to your Honor about the most elegant way to craft it, your Honor.

MR. KAMINSKY: Your Honor, I think we can let pretrial

24

25

I do believe they can monitor phones, but if they 1 can't, obviously he can't have an internet-accessible phone. 2 3 THE COURT: Okay, fine. That's fine with me. 4 MR. KAMINSKY: Your Honor --5 THE COURT: Somehow I rather imagine that we may as 6 well have an initial conference. I rather imagine that the 7 government has provided all the discovery that it really needs 8 to provide. 9 MS. LASKY: Your Honor, we have not. We will be able 10 to do so in a matter of a week or two, your Honor. 11 government and defense --12 THE COURT: Has he been arraigned, by the way? 13 I'm sorry? MS. LASKY: 14 He has not been arraigned, yet, on the THE COURT: 15 indictment? 16 MS. LASKY: Correct, your Honor. 17 THE COURT: Can we arraign him? Thank you, your Honor. 18 MS. LASKY: 19 THE COURT: I had no idea. 20 THE DEPUTY CLERK: Mr. Sanchez, the United States 21 Attorney for the Southern District of New York has filed an 22 Indictment 21 CR 269, which charges you in one count with false

Attorney for the Southern District of New York has filed an Indictment 21 CR 269, which charges you in one count with false information and hoaxes. It states that on or about February 13, 2021, in the Southern District of New York, you knowingly engaged, and attempted to engage, in conduct with

intent to convey false and misleading information under
circumstances where such information may reasonably be
believed, and where such information indicated that an activity
had taken, was taken, or would take place that would constitute
a violation of Title 18, United States Code, Sections 844(i)
and 2332a(a), to wit, you conveyed a hoax, threat to detonate a
bomb in the vicinity of a restaurant in Manhattan, in violation
of Title 18, United States Code, Section 1038(a)(1) and 2.

Have you received a copy of this indictment?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Have you discussed it with your attorney?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: How do you plead at this time to this indictment?

Counsel?

THE COURT: Counsel, you want to enter a plea for him?

MR. KAMINSKY: Not guilty, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Okay. So if the government can finish producing discovery within ten days, Mr. Kaminsky, how much time do you want?

MS. LASKY: Your Honor, just to clarify, the government and defense counsel -- I believe defense counsel is considering our protective order, so we will want to have that

in place, but then ten days should likely be enough, but we have some large videos that the issue has been trying to transfer them and all the technology there, so those might take a little bit longer, but the bulk of it, we can get out, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Kaminsky?

MR. KAMINSKY: I haven't seen the protective order.

I'm not sure why we need one for stuff that was on the internet, but we'll discuss it.

Wait, have you sent me a protective order?

MS. LASKY: Yes.

MR. KAMINSKY: I have not read the protective order that apparently has been sent to me.

I don't think I need more than 30 days to review the discovery, your Honor. The reason why I don't want to rush things is because I might make an application to the Young Adult Opportunity Program, I want to see how the treatment goes. So there are things that are going to be going on other than just my reviewing the discovery, your Honor.

THE COURT: Well, when should we set this for, the next conference?

MR. KAMINSKY: I would say late June, your Honor.

THE COURT: How about July -- I want to be here. I have July 6, 7, 8, 12, 13, 14, 15.

MR. KAMINSKY: Could we do 12, 13, or 15, your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes. We can do the afternoon of the 12th, anytime on the 13th.

Jim, what have we got?

THE DEPUTY CLERK: 3:00 o'clock on the 13th.

THE COURT: Is that okay with the government?

MS. LASKY: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. So 3:00 o'clock on Tuesday,

July 13th. That will be in this courtroom, unless you get a

notice that it's been moved to another courtroom, because my

courtroom can be used for trials.

MR. KAMINSKY: Your Honor, there remains the question of whether Mr. Sanchez can be released today or only once the signatures are on the bond.

THE COURT: I really think we should get everything signed and sealed, please.

MR. KAMINSKY: We'll move expeditiously, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you very much.

So, Mr. Sanchez, I mean business. So I'm letting you go home, but home really is jail, and I mean it. And you better cooperate with your pretrial officer, you better cooperate with your lawyer, you better cooperate with the mental health treatment, you better not think you're smarter than I am, because you're not, you better stay off the internet, and you will be back in this courtroom on the afternoon of July 13th, and we'll see how things are going.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT:

Time is excluded in the interests of justice, the defendant's interests in a speedy trial being outweighed by the need for the government to complete the production of discovery, and with the defendant's consent, correct? MR. KAMINSKY: Yes. THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Anything else? MS. LASKY: Just one remaining question from the government on an administrative note: The copy -- the submission that I filed yesterday, whether I can submit a redacted copy of that on the docket? Because it --THE COURT: Yes. Thank you, your Honor. MS. LASKY: I guess one other administrative note, just to note for the record, is the pretrial conference that was previously scheduled will be --THE COURT: Yes, we'll just get -- move that over to July 13th. MS. LASKY: Thank you, your Honor. THE COURT: There's no reason to bring you back again. MS. LASKY: Right. THE COURT: Okay. MS. LASKY: Okay.

All right. Thank you, everybody.

Ma'am, sorry to make you his jailer, but we'll see

L56KSANC what happens. Okay? Just remember, one misstep, you're going in. THE DEFENDANT: Thank you. * * *